



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,926	10/20/2000	Douglas J. Cowell	00-5019	8386
32127	7590	12/17/2007		
VERIZON			EXAMINER	
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP			LE, KAREN L	
1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 500				
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/17/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@VERIZON.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/692,926	COWELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Karen L. Le	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13, 16-18, 20-43 and 46-53 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13, 16-18, 20-43 and 46-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on August 07, 2007 has been entered. Claims 1, 17 and 31 have been amended. Claims 1-13, 16-18, 20-43 and 46-53 are still pending in this application, with claims 1, 17 and 31 being independent. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 16-18, 20-26, 29-37, 39-43 and 46-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaPierre et al (U.S. 6,795,543) in view of Miloslavsky (US 2001/0043586).

Regarding claims 1-3, 17-18, 20-22, 31-33, LaPierre does not teach a method for routing a call directed to one of a plurality of numbers, each number associated with at least one of a plurality of services. However, Miloslavsky teaches a method for routing a call directed to one of a plurality of numbers, each number associated with at least one of a plurality of services (Abstract, lines 5-12). Lapierre teaches a caller dialing a single universal number, the service control point instructs the calling party to select one of the alternate destinations associated with the subscriber. In response to receiving the calling party input, the service control point obtains the routing information

associated with the chosen destination and instructs the controlling service switching point to route the call to the selected destination (Col. 2, lines 24-35). Miloslavsky teaches a routing system has a routing processor for receiving calls based on information stored in an associated database regarding operation and status of possible destinations for the call. Destinations are call centers adapted for receiving the calls at workstations associated with a central processor. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Miloslavsky into LaPierre's system in order to route a call directed to one of a plurality of numbers or different call centers. Such a system is old and well known in telecommunication system.

LaPierre teaches receiving data from a customer designating routing destinations for service request calls and storing the designated routing destinations in a database (Abs. Lines 1-4),

receiving a call from a calling party, wherein the call includes a trigger number, determining whether or not the trigger number matches a predetermined trigger number (Abs. Lines 6-10)

requesting the calling party to select one of a plurality of related types of first service (abstract, lines 11-15) in response to the determination that the trigger number matches the predetermined trigger number, and

routing the call to one of a plurality of service centers based upon a response from the calling party to the request and the designated routing destinations indicated by the customer data (Abs. Lines 15-19).

LaPierre does not teach requesting the calling party to select a first or second service, in response to the determination that the trigger number does not match the predetermined trigger number. When the trigger number (universal number) does not match the predetermined trigger number, LaPierre teaches routing the call to the dialed directory number or instructing to play an error message back to the caller (Col. 7, lines 20-25). However, LaPierre teaches SCP relays a list of alternate destinations to the calling party and requests the calling party to select one of the alternate destinations associated with the subscriber (Fig. 2, step 214-224). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the teaching of LaPierre in steps 214-224 into step 212 of Fig. 2 in order to request the calling party to select a first or second service, in response to the determination that the trigger number does not match the predetermined trigger number. Such is a design choice or preference involving merely configuring a system as desired.

Regarding claims 4-6, 23-24, and 34-37, LaPierre further teaches wherein routing the call to a second service center further includes: locating the second service center based upon a calling party number associated with the calling party, locating the second service center based upon a state from which the calling party initiates the call (col. 1, lines 32-44 and 51-56), comparing the calling party number with a number plan area table to determine the state from which the calling party initiates the call, collecting status information associated with the call, and storing said status information in a status log (Col. 4, lines 1-14).

Regarding claims 7, 9 and 39, LaPierre further teaches the status information includes information associated with the service selected by the calling party, the type of service selected by the calling party, the service center to which the call was routed and abandoned calls, utilizing the collected status information to determine where subsequent calls are to be routed (Col. 5, lines 66- Col. 7, lines 9).

Regarding claims 10, 25, 40, 42 and 50, LaPierre does not teach when the first service center is associated with a first auxiliary service center, the method further including the steps of: detecting a network fault condition associated with routing the call to the first service center; and rerouting the call to the first auxiliary service center. Routing a call to another service center when detecting a network fault condition is old and well known in call center arts.

Regarding claims 11-13, 26, 41 and 43, LaPierre further teaches the first auxiliary service center is the second service center. The second service center is associated with a second auxiliary second service center, the method further including the steps of: detecting a network fault condition associated with routing the call to the second service center, and rerouting the call to the second auxiliary service center, and as is well known in the call center arts, any of the plurality of service centers can be made to be an auxiliary service center. Such is a design choice or preference involving merely configuring a system as desired.

Regarding claims 16, 29, 30 and 46, LaPierre teaches the type of the second service is one of residential and business (Abs. Lines 14-15). LaPierre does not teach the first service is ADSL service and the second service is ISDN service and wherein the type of the first service is one of residential and business ADSL service, and the type of the second service is one of residential and business ISDN service.

Note that LaPierre is not limited by the services and/or types of services that may be offered and in fact, contemplate their systems being used for almost any service. Again, such is merely a design and preference choice. Therefore, requesting residential or business service would be obvious and is also old and well known as a distinction when requesting service. Also, because ISDN and ADSL are well known protocols and configurations in telecommunication system, such would also be obvious as a service type. Even applicant's claims suggest this flexibility and interchangeability between the services/service types.

Regarding claims 47 – 49 and 51, such a feature merely describes a manual action by a customer and has nothing at all to do with the implementation of operation of the claimed invention. If a customer or calling party wishes to manually consult with a report or listen to certain data before making his/her request and base his/her request on that report or data, that is done before a call is even made. For the purposes of examination, examiner will still address the limitation.

As such, this limitation would be extremely obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because such a limitation is common sense. If a customer or calling party hears that a certain business or service is in operational, of course that customer or calling party would adjust his/her request accordingly. In LaPierre et al. for example, the network routes converted calls to appropriate pre-selected carriers in accord with existing subscriber picks when necessary (Fig. 2, item 218). Likewise if the customer or calling party has personal experience or reads somewhere that customer service for a service provider for telephony service is inadequate, he/she will likely want to be directed to a different service provider for telephony service. Another example is commonly seen wherein sports fans will try to make calls to ticket brokers outside their local area(s) in order to have a better chance of getting through to a broker. Sports teams most always have the most popularity in the region or immediate locale. Therefore, calling ticket brokers locally or calling local ticket brokers usually results in more busy signals since the local traffic is jamming up lines. Not so in remote or other locales wherein tickets for that sports team is not as popular. Nearly any scenario can be contemplated.

Regarding claim 52, LaPierre teaches the designated routing destinations are non-predetermined (Fig. 2, item 224).

Regarding claim 53, LaPierre teaches the calling party and the customer are different entities (Abs. Lines 1-4)

4. Claims 8 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaPierre et al (U.S. 6,795,543) in view of Falcon et al (U. S. 2002/0076031).

Regarding claims 8 and 38, LaPierre further teaches the status information includes information associated with the service selected by the calling party, the type of the service selected by the calling party. LaPierre does not teach the service center to which the call was routed and abandoned calls.

However, it is old and well known in the call center art to address the issue of abandoned calls as taught by Falcon et al. (P. 1, ¶ 0002). Falcon et al. also teaches a system for connecting a caller making a service request to any number of agents, remote or local, servicing a plurality of call centers, taking and storing caller information such as past caller history which would include any calls abandoned by a caller. (P. 3, ¶ 0025, 0028, 0029 of Falcon et al.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated such information in the combination of LaPierre et al. and Falcon inasmuch as this is common problem, and because it is also old and well known for service centers to provide a higher priority to a caller who previously abandoned a call in hopes of gaining their business and lessening a caller's frustration at having to abandon their call.

5. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaPierre et al (U.S. 6,795,543) in view of US 4,839,916 (Fields et al.) and/or US 5,838,767 (Aoyama).

As to claims 27 and 28, what LaPierre does not teach is determining whether a call is from a test generator and if not, continuing with the above-discussed steps.

However, it is extremely old and well known for systems to have the ability to detect when a call or action is real or when it is merely a test. Fields et al. and Aoyama teach such systems. (Col. 18, lines 1 – 23 of Fields et al. and Col. 2, lines 18 – 39 of Aoyama). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have implemented such a test call check inasmuch as both Fields et al. and Aoyama teach test call generators for use in testing a telecommunications system. Moreover, just generally, there is ample motivation for the ability to check whether a call is a test call or real. Determining whether or not a call is real would enable a user to save resources for example. Also, if for example, one considers an alarm system that should be tested, it would be desirable for the system to know when an alarm is a test alarm or actual so as not to incur subsequent action from the police or security. Moreover, in terms of statistics gathering, it would be desirable for telecommunications systems not to include test calls in actual data. These are simply a few motivations. Finally, the claimed “tests” that are claimed are commensurate with the operation of the system regarding receiving requests, properly processing those requests, etc. Therefore, any testing feature or test call generator would obviously be used to test such operation of the system. As noted above, tests or

testing systems can be used to test nearly any aspect of a telephony system. Such is a design choice or preference that can be implemented merely by addressing the programming of the test protocol and/or hardware and/or software.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13, 16-18, 20-43 and 46-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen L. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-7487. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing F. Chan can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Karen Le
KLL

October 29, 2007


AHMAD F. MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700